

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06586 704 4

GovDoc



M3/B16

RA

94/4

n.d.

Campus High School Urban Renewal Area

J84

3



---

RESPONSE TO URBAN AID CRITIQUE OF CAMPUS HIGH RELOCATION PLAN

---

A. The first question raised in the Critique is whether there will be sufficient housing resources not only for families and individuals displaced by the proposed Campus High Project but also for those who will be displaced by other projects during the same period of time.

We anticipate that the demand for housing resources for families displaced by governmental action during 1967 and 1968 will be as follows:

PROJECT	TOTAL RELOCATION PERIOD	ESTIMATED RELOCATION 1967 - 1968	ESTIMATED REQUIRED RESOURCES		
			PUBLIC	PRIVATE	SALES
Charlestown	4 years	250	60	120	70
South Cove	2 years	430	60	330	40
South End	7 years	950	200	640	110
Campus High	2 years	384	195	138	51
Fenway	4 years	250	36	176	38
Inner Belt & Southwest Expressway	3 years	1,050	350	500	200
TOTAL		3,314	901	1,904	509

Therefore, only twenty-three families and individuals on an average need be relocated each month from each of the displacement areas in order to comply with the above schedule.



The 1960 United States Census reported that in the two-year period 1958-59, 27,806 rental units were vacated and then reoccupied, that is, approximately 13,903 rental units a year. The number of resources which we show on form HUD-6122 of the Relocation Report for the Campus High Urban Renewal Project represents only 20% of this estimated turnover of private rental housing units in Boston.

20% OF ESTIMATED AVAILABLE SUPPLY

<u>ONE BEDROOM</u>		<u>TWO BEDROOMS</u>		<u>THREE BEDROOMS</u>	
Required	Avail. Supply	Required	Avail. Supply	Required	Avail. Supply
85	2113	45	2144	4	865

---

<u>FOUR BEDROOMS</u>		<u>FIVE BEDROOMS</u>	
Required	Avail. Supply	Required	Avail. Supply
4	390	0	60

B. Urban Planning Aid notes that 195 families and individuals are proposed to be rehoused in Public Housing and raises several questions in regards to this proposal.

1. The first question asks whether families and individuals who are financially eligible will be willing to accept public housing.

It is true that our experience has been that some eligible families refuse to move into existing public housing units; on the other hand, our experience with the rent subsidy program has been that all families who were given the opportunity to benefit from this program did so enthusiastically.



The Boston Housing Authority has received federal approval to provide one-thousand units of rent subsidized leased housing. The proposed number of units by size to be leased is as follows:

3 Bedrooms-----	100 units
4 Bedrooms-----	200 units
5 Bedrooms-----	200 units
6 Bedrooms-----	100 units
Apartments for the elderly-----	400 units
<hr/>	
TOTAL-----	1000 units

Consequently, by utilizing both the available resources in existing public housing accommodations (1900 units available on an annual basis through turnover) as well as the 1,000 new leased housing units, we are confident that the 195 families and individuals requiring public housing will accept units in one or the other of these programs. It is also true that families and individuals displaced by governmental action receive priority status for public housing units.

2. Urban Planning Aid observed that the minimum rent for federally-aided projects is \$45 per month for families and elderly individuals, while the minimum rents in state-aided projects range from \$50 to \$57 per month. Urban Planning Aid specifically asks whether it is desirable for families having rent-paying abilities that are below public housing minimum rents, to be supported

The Boston Housing Authority has received Federal approval to provide one-thousand units of rent subsidized leased housing. The proposed number of units by size to be leased is as follows:

3 Bedrooms	100 units
4 Bedrooms	200 units
5 Bedrooms	200 units
6 Bedrooms	100 units
Apartments for the elderly	400 units
TOTAL	1,000 units

Consequently, by utilizing both the available resources in existing public housing accommodations (1,000 units available) as the 1,000 new units, the total public housing will exceed 2,000 units in one or the other of these programs. It is also true that families and individuals displaced by governmental action receive priority status for public housing units.

2. Urban Planning Aid observed that the minimum rent for federally-aided projects is \$45 per month for families and elderly individuals, while the minimum rents in state-aided projects range from \$50 to \$57 per month. Urban Planning Aid specifically asks whether it is desirable for families having rent-paying abilities that are below public housing minimum rents, to be reported

by public welfare as a result of the renewal program.

It appears that Urban Planning Aid is making an assumption that families and individuals within the proposed Campus High Urban Renewal Area whose incomes are below \$200 per month are now paying less than the minimum rents charged by the Boston Housing Authority. To ascertain if this assumption is valid, we have examined the survey cards that we have compiled on families in the area.

With three exceptions, these survey cards list both a contract rent and an additional amount for heat and utilities. Because we have found that some families claim to be paying an excessive amount for heat and utilities, we have disregarded the amounts for heat and utilities shown on the survey cards. Instead, we have added the Conservative figure of \$25 per month for heat and utilities to the amounts shown for contract rent. The results show that the white families and individuals are paying an average gross rent of \$60 per month and non-white families are paying an average gross rent of \$67 per month.

The process of urban renewal has absolutely nothing to do with eligibility requirements for public welfare. The sole justification for a public welfare system is to provide assistance to families and individuals whose means of subsistence is below the survival level.



Urban Planning Aid appears to be saying that it is socially desirable to have families and individuals remain in substandard housing with inadequate funds for food, clothing and other necessities of life. We believe that all families and individuals are entitled to an opportunity to secure decent housing with adequate income for other necessities of life.

3. The question raised by Urban Planning Aid about the availability of public housing resources when they are needed has been answered in Section B 1. of this report.

Families being relocated are not ordered to move as suggested by Urban Planning Aid. Rather, eligible families and individuals who wish to move to public housing are assisted by the Authority's staff to secure units in existing projects or through the leased housing program.

4. Experience in the Washington Park relocation program has shown that during the relocation process, families and individuals with social and economic problems can be, and are, helped to benefit from public and private housing. Families with behavioral or social adjustment problems are not discarded to shift for themselves but are provided with extensive social services appropriate to their needs.



C. Housing Resources.

One can always cast doubt on any statistical fact while offering no sound basis for this doubt. While we will continue to assume that information gained from the U. S. Census is substantially correct, we will also continue to update our information. Consequently, a survey was made of those units listed on one day (July 31, 1966) in one newspaper (Boston Globe). Please refer to Appendices I and II for the results.

Urban Aid also implies that the amounts shown on the average rent schedule adopted by the Authority for Relocation Adjustment Payments are those which families must pay to obtain decent housing. Again, a review of the actual situation proves the facts to be otherwise. An analysis of the 178 cases approved by the Boston Redevelopment Authority for Relocation Adjustment Payments, shown in Appendices III and IV, indicates that families in each apartment size category are paying a lower amount than that which is shown on the rent schedule.

D. The relocation program for the Campus High Urban Renewal Area does not rely on units of 221 (d) (3) housing to be constructed. The 221 (d) (3) figures are listed below merely to show that new housing, as well as existing units, will be among the choices available to those displaced.

It is anticipated that final approval of the Campus High Urban Renewal Area will be received about March 1967. State



Law prohibits any governmental agency from requiring families and individuals to move in less than four months after acquisition of the property in which they reside.

Although it is true that some families will voluntarily move during the four-month period, most will not. Consequently, the relocation of families and individuals from the Campus High Urban Renewal Area is expected to get underway in July 1967 and to be carried out during the subsequent two-year period. Thus, by relocating an average of sixteen families and individuals per month, we can satisfactorily complete the relocation program.

221 (d) (3) DEVELOPMENTS, WASHINGTON PARK

Academy II -- 316 units now under construction -- completion date June 1967

1 bedroom	22	\$75 per month
2 bedroom	84	85
3 bedroom	130	95
4 bedroom	80	105

Note: These are Cooperative units, with a down payment of \$150

---

Charlame II -- 38 units -- completion date August 1967

2 bedroom	8
3 bedroom	12
4 bedroom	18

Note: All units will be under the rent supplement program and families will pay 25% of income for rent.

---



St. Joseph -- 126 units -- completion date December 1967

1 bedroom	16	\$75 per month
2 bedroom	38	95
3 bedroom	52	115
4 bedroom	30	130
5 bedroom	6	145

Note: 40% of these units will be under the rent supplement program and families will pay 25% of income for rent.

---

12 Baptist -- 54 units -- completion date December 1967

Efficiency units	2
1 bedroom	10
2 bedroom	24
3 bedroom	12
4 bedroom	6

Note: All units will be under the rent supplement program and families will pay 25% of income for rent.

---

Warren Gardens -- 200 units -- completion date February 1968

Efficiency units	29	\$75 per month
1 bedroom	17	89
3 bedroom	187	125
4 bedroom	6	145

---

General Note:

1. All of the rents listed in 221 (d) (3) Developments include heat and hot water.
  2. Since only forty families and individuals remain to be relocated from Washington Park, these units will be available to families and individuals from the proposed Campus High Urban Renewal Area on a priority basis.
- 
- 

In addition to the 221 (d) (3) units, other types of housing will be available.

Phalanx -- 15 units of sales housing -- completion date July 1967

2 bedroom	\$15,000
3 bedroom	16,000



- E. Urban Aid assumes that (1) the relocation report leans heavily on Relocation Adjustment Payments as a way of meeting the needs of families who cannot afford the rents charged in decent housing, and (2) that these payments are made over the period of one year.

The facts are: (1) Relocation Adjustment Payments are used to motivate families with low incomes to seek public housing where the need is indicated. (Before such a family can receive a Relocation Adjustment Payment, it must apply for public housing, and if the family is not offered a unit within a reasonable period of time, then it may be eligible for a Relocation Adjustment Payment. The Boston Redevelopment Authority and the Boston Housing Authority have agreed that three months is a reasonable period of time.) (2) If an offer of an acceptable unit requires more than three months, the family is encouraged to remain on-site until such an offer is made. If, however, the family elects to move, staff will seek standard housing within the family's ability to pay. (3) Families cannot receive a Relocation Adjustment Payment unless they move to standard housing. (4) Approved Relocation Adjustment Payment funds will be mailed to the eligible family over a five-month period of time. (5) These payments were not conceived or planned as rent supplements and are not described as such.



- F. The procedure of surveying a sample of residents and using the sample as a basis for determining needs and requirements is recognized as sound in government as well as in academic circles. However, when the relocation process begins, all families and individuals are surveyed so that appropriate assistance can be made on an individualized basis.
- G. Although families and individuals generally move to areas close to the clearance area, the Washington Park relocation experience shows that nearly 40 per cent did move to other sections of the city and an additional 9 per cent moved to suburban areas. (See Appendix V.) It is the responsibility of the Redevelopment Authority, as a public agency, to provide knowledge of housing resources in all parts of the city. Nevertheless, for those families who do choose to relocate close to the clearance area, Section D above shows that adequate relocation resources will be available in the adjacent Washington Park Area.
- H. Urban Planning Aid may feel that 20% or even 15% of income is the proper standard in determining a family's ability to pay rent. The Boston Redevelopment Authority, however, accepts the federal government's standard, as reflected in the rent supplementation program, of 25% of income.
- I. Finally, Urban Aid questions the methodology and conclusions stated in the estimates of housing resources. (Statement accompanying Form H-6122.)



1. This question will be answered in item five below.
2. The availability of Census document HC (2) NO31-Housing 1960 - Boston, Mass., made it possible to check the report's estimate of the rental housing distribution in the City of Boston. Tables B 2. and B 10. show the median rents to be around \$80 for occupied units and slightly less than \$60 for vacant units. The difference can be partially explained by two factors -- first, the typical occupied unit is larger in size than the typical vacant unit and second, the Census uses gross rents for occupied units, and in most cases, uses contract rents for vacant units. However, the conclusion of the U.P.A. that the rents on vacant units are significantly higher than occupied units is not evident from the Census data.

Furthermore, Table B-10 shows that in the critical \$40 to \$80 per month three or more bedroom category, there were 831 vacant units available. A reasonable estimate would be that about 650 of these units had all plumbing facilities. (Approximately 79% of these 4,000 units in the \$40 to \$80 rental range had all plumbing facilities. If this same percentage were applied to the 831 units which have three or more bedrooms, over 650 units would be in this category.) The estimate of the supply of the above units in the report calls for 549 units with all plumbing facilities. Thus it appears we have underestimated the supply of low-rent, large-size apartments on the basis of census data.



For the large but more expensive apartments (\$80 and over per month), the Census Report lists 124 units of which more than 100 units were standard. Our estimate of the supply shows 691 such units and is greatly over-estimated. However, the total need is for only eight of these units.

For the smaller size units (zero to two bedrooms) the census report lists over 7,500 units in the vacant category. Even if all the 3,000 vacant units as listed in the report which lacked plumbing facilities were in this category, there would still be 4,000 units available for relocation. The total estimate of the supply of such units in the report was 4,300 units, the total need was for only 130 units.

3. and 4. The question here is on the validity of our assumption that the distribution of numbers of bedrooms in vacant units is similar to that in occupied units.

In this case the 1960 census data support our position.

The distribution is as follows:

Number of Bedrooms	Renter Occupied Units		Vacant Units For Rent	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 - 1	65,234	40.0%	4,856	55.0%
2	56,464	34.5%	2,753	31.0%
3 or more	41,744	25.5%	1,259	14.0%
TOTAL	163,442	100.0%	8,979	100.0%



It can be seen that vacant bedroom distribution roughly approximates occupied bedroom distribution. This is so particularly if an allowance is made for the fact that the small apartment is over-represented among the vacant units (because of the high mobility of the one-person or two-person household). In any case, what is important, is the existence of over 40,000 three or more bedroom units in the renter market.

5. During the period 1960 - 1965, 9,908 housing units were demolished. In addition, 705 housing units were lost through merger with other units. Thus, the housing stock was reduced by a total of 10,713 units. However, during the same period, 26,609 units were added to the housing stock (22,917 units through new construction and 3,692 units through conversion). The net result of both processes is an increase of 15,800 units in the City's housing stock. The above information plus additional data for the years 1956 - 1959 is shown in Appendix V, "Changes in the Housing Inventory of the City of Boston: 1956-1965."

During the same period, between 1960 and 1965, Boston's population dropped from 698,000 to 617,366, an absolute loss of 80,634 and a relative loss of 11%.

It is reasonable to conclude that since the housing stock



has increased while the population has dropped, there is now more housing per capita than was reported in the 1960 Census (see Appendices VI and VII).

6. The question raised in this section has been answered in Section B. 4. above.
7. It is unclear what is meant by the "inflationary effect outlined above." If the implication is that a reduced supply raises the price, then the statement is irrelevant because the supply of housing has increased. If the implication is that the rent level has risen because of inflationary pressures throughout the economy, then the statement is not necessarily true. Inflation is a general concept; it is the net effect of all price changes. It is possible for the price of some goods to drop while inflation still occurs because more of other goods have risen in price. This uneven effect is possible, too, within a particular market such as housing: prices in one area can be low due to weak demand at the same time that rents are high in the other areas. Hence, general rises in rent are no sure indication that the prices of relocation housing have risen.
8. The information regarding the number of utility shut-offs in the Relocation Report was included to provide more up-to-date information on housing turnover. Even if



25% of the 16,172 shut-offs between January through July 1964 represent demolition of units or failure to pay bills by continuing tenants, then over 12,000 units would have been available through turnover to persons seeking housing.

9. Although we do make surveys of units listed in the real estate section of certain newspapers (in this case the Boston Globe), the purpose is not intended to support or deny data gained from the U. S. Census.

Obviously, this kind of survey is much too limited in scope to provide any judgment on Census data. Its primary value is to indicate that on any one day in time, units are available in rents and sizes which are suitable to families and individuals to be displaced.

The more recent survey by staff of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, which has been included as Appendix I of this report, indicates the continual availability of even more such units. It is significant to note that 227 of the units listed in this survey, or 33%, rent for less than \$90 per month. Although it is true that only 23 units having three or more bedrooms are listed renting under \$100 per month, it must be recognized that the less expensive apartments are by and large not advertised in the newspapers. The relocation staff gains information on such units through its extensive contacts with landlords and realtors. In any case, the information given



on new 221 (d) (3) units to be constructed within the Washington Park Urban Renewal Area indicates that sufficient units in sizes and rents will be available to families from the proposed Campus High Urban Renewal Area on a priority basis.



APPENDIX I

SURVEY OF GROSS RENTAL COST  
OF APARTMENTS UNDER \$150 PER MONTH  
(BOSTON GLOBE-JULY 31, 1966)

Gross Monthly Rental Cost**	Number of Rooms								Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
\$ 20 - 29	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
30 - 39	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
40 - 49	12	1	10	2	-	-	-	-	25
50 - 59	6	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	11
60 - 69	10	2	1	2	1	-	-	-	16
70 - 79	8	7	5	14	2	-	-	-	36
80 - 89	33*	47*	42	5	6	1	-	-	134
90 - 99	7	6	19*	14	9	4	-	-	59
100 -109	7	6	15	6	16*	6	-	-	56
110 -119	6	1	11	13	5	7*	-	-	43
120 -129	13	5	15	9	5	4	-	-	51
130 -149	23	2	32	167*	8	3	-	1	236
TOTAL	130	78	152	234	52	25	0	1	672

\*\* For apartments, where heat and utilities were not included in the contract rent, the following amounts were added to adjust to gross rental costs:

<u>Apt. Size</u>	<u>Utilities</u>	<u>Heat</u>
1-2 rooms	\$3.00	\$18.00
3-5 rooms	5.00	20.00
6 or more rooms	7.00	22.00

\*Median price range



APPENDIX II

Distribution of Gross Rentals Under \$150. Per month  
by Area of the City

	<u>No. of Rentals</u>		<u>%</u>
Back Bay-----	67	--	10.0
Beacon Hill-----	20	--	3.0
Brighton (& Allston)-----	121	--	18.0
Charlestown-----	11	--	1.6
Dorchester-----	130	--	19.5
Downtown North-----	3	--	.4
East Boston-----	3	--	.4
Hyde Park-----	144	--	21.4
Jamaica Plain-----	35	--	5.2
Kenmore Square-----	2	--	.3
Parker Hill-Fenway-----	33	--	4.9
Roslindale-----	46	--	6.9
Roxbury-----	28	--	4.2
Roxbury-No. Dorchester-----	3	--	.4
South Boston-----	9	--	1.3
South End-----	3	--	.4
West End-----	0	--	0.0
West Roxbury-----	8	--	1.2
Miscellaneous-----	6	--	.9
TOTAL-----	672	--	100.0



APPENDIX III

RENTAL RATES OF STANDARD APARTMENTS OCCUPIED  
BY DISPLACEES APPROVED FOR RELOCATION ADJUSTMENT PAYMENTS  
JULY 1965 - JUNE 1966

CONTRACT RENTS						
<u>Number of Bedrooms</u>						
Rental Range	1	2	3	4	5 or more	Total
Under \$40	5	2	0	0	0	7
40 - 49	3	4	1	0	0	8
50 - 59	4	7	4	1	0	16
60 - 69	1	10	15	0	1	27
70 - 79	0	9	9	2	2	22
80 - 89	0	2	2	0	3	7
90 - 99	0	0	0	1	0	1
100 - 109	0	0	0	0	0	0
110 - 119	0	0	0	0	0	0
120 - 129	0	0	0	0	0	0
130 & over	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	13	34	31	4	6	88
Average (\$)	39.69	61.29	66.76	74.50	77.83	61.76
Relocation Adjustment Payment Schedule	92.00	100.00	110.00	125.00	135.00	



APPENDIX IV

RENTAL RATES OF STANDARD APARTMENTS OCCUPIED  
BY DISPLACEES APPROVED FOR RELOCATION ADJUSTMENT PAYMENTS  
JULY 1965 - JUNE 1966

GROSS RENTS						
<u>Number of Bedrooms</u>						
<u>Rental Range</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5 or more</u>	<u>Total</u>
Under \$40	0	0	0	0	0	0
40 - 49	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 - 59	1	0	0	0	0	1
60 - 69	0	0	0	0	0	0
70 - 79	2	1	0	0	0	3
80 - 89	5	25	0	0	0	30
90 - 99	4	8	19	1	0	32
100 - 109	0	4	2	10	0	16
110 - 119	0	2	1	1	0	4
120 - 129	1	1	2	0	0	4
130 & over	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	13	41	24	12	0	90
Average (\$)	86.81	90.60	98.67	104.50	--	94.06
Relocation Adjustment Payment Schedule	92.00	100.00	110.00	125.00	135.00	
	*61.00	79.00	85.00	90.00	105.00	

\*There were an additional 71 cases approved for Relocation Adjustment Payments but it was impossible to determine whether the rent was contract or gross. However, the average rent in these cases are shown here.



APPENDIX V

AREAS INTO WHICH FAMILIES FROM  
WASHINGTON PARK URBAN RENEWAL AREA  
HAVE MOVED  
(As of October 1, 1965)

---

	Private Rental		Sales	Bos. Hous.		%
	Standard	Substandard		Auth.	Total	
Washington Park	349	14	27	0	390	26.1
Roxbury (remainder)	267	38	19	72	396	26.5
Dorchester	247	10	107	37	401	26.8
Jamaica Plain	43	0	18	50	111	7.4
South End	4	2	0	8	14	.9
Other Sections of Boston	27	3	6	17	53	3.6
Greater Boston	18	1	44	0	63	4.2
Other Cities	32	0	33	2	67	4.5
<hr/>						
TOTAL	987	68	254	186	1,495	100%

---

---



# APPENDIX VI

## CHANGES IN THE HOUSING INVENTORY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON 1956 - 1965

Year	Housing Units Added To the Housing Inventory			Housing Units Removed From the Housing Inventory			
	New Units	Conver- sions	Total	Demo- litions	Mergers	Total	Net Change
1956-60	3,500	1,716	5,216	8,410	302	8,712	- 3,496
1961-65	21,594	3,269	24,863	8,234	649	8,883	+15,980
1956	571	300	871	1,167	21	1,188	- 317
1957	397	195	592	1,559	98	1,657	- 1,065
1958	603	381	984	2,229	97	2,326	- 1,342
1959	606	444	1,050	1,681	30	1,711	- 661
1960	1,323	396	1,719	1,774	56	1,830	- 111
1961	1,714	553	2,267	1,226	105	1,331	- 936
1962	2,373	829	3,202	745	101	846	+ 2,356
1963	4,032	527	4,559	1,924	95	2,019	+ 2,540
1964	10,049	893	10,942	2,554	238	2,792	+ 8,150
1965	3,426	467	3,893	1,785	110	1,895	+ 1,998
	25,094	4,985	30,079	16,644	951	17,595	+12,484

Source: Building Department, City of Boston



## APPENDIX VII

CHANGES IN BOSTON'S POPULATION ACCORDING TO  
GNRP AND IMPROVEMENT AREAS: 1950-1975

	Population 1950 <sup>1</sup> /	Population 1960 <sup>1</sup> /	Absolute Change 1950-1960 <sup>1</sup> /	Percent Change 1950-1960 <sup>1</sup> /	State Census 1965 <sup>2</sup> /
GNRP AREAS:					
Charlestown-----	31,332	20,638	-10,694	-34.1%	16,381
South End-----	55,450	33,735	-21,724	-39.2%	24,926
East Boston-----	39,526	31,910	-7,616	-19.3%	29,335
Downtown-Downtown No.	37,798	29,617	-8,181	-21.6%	20,964
Back Bay-----	21,228	18,292	-2,936	-13.8%	14,635
Jamaica Plain-----	42,433	41,606	-827	-2.0%	42,430
Parker Hill-Fenway	49,939	45,519	-4,420	-8.9%	25,154
Roxbury-No. Dorch.---	107,899	82,247	-25,652	-23.8%	67,605
South Boston-----	53,072	48,392	-4,680	-8.8%	39,846
Sub-Total-----	438,686	351,956	-86,730	-19.8%	281,276
IMPROVEMENT AREAS:					
Beacon Hill-West End	14,809	4,672	-10,137	-68.5%	4,192
Dorchester-----	164,208	158,139	-6,069	-3.7%	151,212
Roslindale-----	40,196	39,417	-779	-1.9%	38,742
Brighton-----	67,188	64,169	-3,019	-4.5%	58,515
Orient Heights-----	11,554	12,182	+628	+5.4%	10,457
Hyde Park-----	29,627	34,633	+5,006	+16.9%	39,755
West Roxbury-----	23,533	25,977	+2,444	+10.4%	28,941
Other-----	11,643	6,935	-4,708	-40.4%	4,276
Sub-Total-----	362,758	346,124	-16,634	-4.5%	336,090
CITY TOTAL-----	801,444	698,080	-103,364	-12.9%	617,366

<sup>1</sup> Includes "crews of vessels "<sup>2</sup> Excludes nonresident persons residing in dormitories, lodging houses, etc.



3484B

BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
RESPONSE TO URBAN AID CRITIQUE OF  
CAMPUS HIGH RELOCATION PLAN

BOS  
RES  
CAMP

DATE	ISSUED TO
10/4/68	Vicki Layses
1/27/70	Carden

